

REMARKS

This Amendment is fully responsive to the final Office Action dated March 25, 2010, issued in connection with the above-identified application. Claims 1-7, 12-17, 21-31, 39 and 40 are pending in the present application. With this Amendment, claims 1, 12-17, 21, 22, 29-31, 39 and 40 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced by the amendments made to the claims. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morito (U.S. Patent No. 6,782,190, hereafter “Morito”) in view of Miller et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,149,754, hereafter “Miller”), and further in view of Yamanaka et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0079042, hereafter “Yamanaka”); and claims 12-17, 21-31, 39 and 40 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morito in view of Yamanaka.

The Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 12-17, 21, 22, 29-31, 39 and 40 to more clearly distinguish the present invention from the cited prior art. Independent claim 1 (as amended) recites the following features:

“[a]n aggregation system comprising an aggregation apparatus, a first reproduction apparatus and a second reproduction apparatus,

wherein said aggregation apparatus includes:

a first obtainment unit operable to obtain a main content including video data and audio data from a first recording medium;

a second obtainment unit operable to obtain a sub content including either audio data or subtitle data; and

a recording unit operable to aggregate the main content and the sub content and record the aggregated contents onto a second recording medium,

said first reproduction apparatus includes:

a third obtainment unit operable to obtain the main content from the first recording medium;

a fourth obtainment unit operable to obtain reproduction control information for controlling reproduction of the main content; and

a reproduction unit operable to reproduce the main content recorded on the first recording medium and the sub content, based on the reproduction control information, so that the audio data of the main content is replaced with either the audio data of the sub content or the subtitle

data of the sub content to be reproduced, and

said second reproduction apparatus reproduces the main content and the sub content which are recorded on the second recording medium so that the audio data of the main content is replaced with either the audio data of the sub content or the subtitle data of the sub content to be reproduced.” (Emphasis added).

The features emphasized above in independent claim 1 are similarly recited in independent claims 12-17, 21, 22, 29-31, 39 and 40 (as amended). Specifically, independent claims 12-17, 21, 22, 29-31, 39 and 40 have been amended to point out that “audio data of the main content is replaced with either the audio data of the sub content or the subtitle data of the sub content to be reproduced.” Additionally, the feature emphasized above in independent claim 1 (and similarly recited in independent claims 12-17, 21, 22, 29-31, 39 and 40) are fully supported by the Applicants’ disclosure.

The present invention (as recited in independent claims 1, 12-17, 21, 22, 29-31, 39 and 40) is distinguishable from the cited prior art in that the present invention (i) aggregates the main content and the sub content and records the aggregated main content and sub content onto a recording medium, and (ii) reproduces the main content and the sub content so that the audio data of the main content is replaced with either the audio data of the sub content or the subtitle data of the sub content to be reproduced.

In the Office Action, the Examiner relies on the combination of Morito, Miller and Yamanaka; and the combination of Morito and Yamanaka for disclosing or suggesting all the features recited in independent claims 1, 12-17, 21, 22, 29-31, 39 and 40.

However, the Applicants assert that the Morito, Miller and Yamanaka, individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest the features now recited in 1, 12-17, 21, 22, 29-31, 39 and 40, as amended.

Morito discloses a copy protection apparatus that checks whether or not a disk to-be-played back is either an original disk or an authorized copy, and, if not, prevents play-back and recording of the data of the disk. Although Morito is directed to copyright protection, the reference fails to disclose or suggest an intention to aggregate content, or record or reproduce aggregated content. Additionally, Morito fails to clearly describe that the main content and the sub content are reproduced so that the audio data of the main content is replaced with either the

audio data of the sub content or the subtitle data of the sub content to be reproduced, as recited in independent claims 1, 12-17, 21, 22, 29-31, 39 and 40 (as amended).

Miller discloses a method and system for loading information onto a computer in the form of a digital capsule containing information regarding, for example, products for sale. In Miller, an encapsulated media file may be authenticated by the capsule administrator by comparing it with a copy of itself stored by the capsule administrator, and the original capsule data and original media file may be separated from the encapsulated media file.

However, similar to Morito, Miller fails to disclose or suggest that the main content and the sub content are reproduced so that the audio data of the main content is replaced with either the audio data of the sub content or the subtitle data of the sub content to be reproduced, as recited in independent claims 1, 12-17, 21, 22, 29-31, 39 and 40 (as amended).

Moreover, Yamanaka fails to overcome the deficiencies noted above in Morito and Miller. Yamanaka discloses a content aggregator 200 that collects content data sets (e.g., the content data sets included in the content holders 120a to 120n shown in Fig. 1), and edits the collected content sets.

However, Yamanaka also fails to describe that the main content and the sub content are reproduced so that the audio data of the main content is replaced with either the audio data of the sub content or the subtitle data of the sub content to be reproduced, as recited in independent claims 1, 12-17, 21, 22, 29-31, 39 and 40 (as amended).

Based on the above discussion, Morito, Miller and Yamanaka, individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all the features recited in independent claims 1, 12-17, 21, 22, 29-31, 39 and 40 (as amended). Additionally, Morito, Miller and Yamanaka, individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all the features recited in claims 2-7 and 23-28 at least by virtue of their respective dependencies from independent claims 1 and 22.

In light of the above, the Applicants submit that all the pending claims are patentable over the prior art of record. The Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections presented in the outstanding Office Action, and pass the present application to issue.

Additionally, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone to resolve any remaining issues in the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Masato YAMAMICHI et al.

/Mark D. Pratt/

By 2010.06.15 13:53:24 -04'00'

Mark D. Pratt

Registration No. 45,794

Attorney for Applicants

MDP/clw
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
June 15, 2010